

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. IX. No. 18.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1806.

[PRICE 10D.]

"It is peculiarly the duty of the House of Commons to watch over the purse of the nation; and, it is the duty of the nation to come forward and encourage the House of Commons to proceed with activity and rigour in its laudable efforts to bring to punishment all those who have wasted the public money, especially in cases, where, to such waste, is joined a daring violation of the law."—**LORD TEMPLE'S** Speech at the county meeting in Hampshire, on the 16th of May, 1805.

641]

[642

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AFFAIRS OF INDIA. (Continued from pages 171, 197, 237, 303, 368, 460, 530, 545, and 609.) Since the state of the proceedings against Lord Wellesley was given in page 624, there has been but one debate, in the House of Commons, upon the subject; and that was on Monday, the 28th instant, upon a motion made by Mr. Paull for *printing* the Charge, which he, as the reader was informed, laid upon the table on the preceding Tuesday, and a report of which charge, as given in the newspapers, will be found in page 615.—Mr. Paull, in making his motion on the 28th, began by producing several precedents, showing that he was perfectly regular in bringing forward his Charge previous to the production of any documents, or other evidence, in support of it; and, from one precedent, it appeared, that so perfect is, or *was*, the right of impeachment in every member of the house, that any member had a right to prefer a charge against any subject of the realm upon the ground of mere report, or *rumour*! Yet, be it recollected, that, on the 22d instant, the "Man of the People" told Mr. Paull, that he preferred the charge "at his *peril*!" This is a phrase that ought never to be forgotten. It is the boldest attack that ever was made upon the privileges of the people as well as of their representatives. What! does a member of parliament speak at his *peril*? And what is the difference between a charge made verbally and a charge made in writing? Many are the attempts, which, at different periods of our history, have been made to pare down the privileges of members of parliament; but this is an attempt to cut them up by the roots. The privileges of parliament that are really useful to the people, are those of the *individual* member; but, of late years, particularly, the great object of ministers seems to have been to fritter these away, and to make a loud noise about the privileges of the *House*; that is to say, of the *majority*; and that is to say, of the *ministry*. Mr. Paull might, indeed, speak; he, who had seen that which he came to

complain of, might speak, he might complain, he might even make a Charge; but he did it "at his *peril*." Oh! what an excellent motto to write up over the door of the Whig-Club room!—In the last debate, the Marquis of Douglas and Mr. Windham expressed their decided disapprobation of the manner, in which Mr. Paull had been treated at the time of bringing forward his Charge. The public had expressed their disapprobation before; and, whatever may be thought of it, the feeling which that treatment has excited, from one end of the country to the other, will not be easily done away.—Mr. Paull, in the debate, to the subject of which we will now return, reminded the House, that, in the papers which had been delivered the day after his Charge was laid upon the table, there was evidence in support of his Charge, and that, upon this ground, he now *demand*ed, as his right, that the Charge should be printed. He went into a very long, and a very able statement, to show how those papers bore upon the subject of the Charge. He clearly shewed, that this was the sort of evidence which Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan had represented as necessary to render the printing of the Charge proper; and, after much manly animadversion upon the conduct of his opponents, he concluded by saying, that he had asked no one to second his motion, being resolved to leave it to the House to second it, or not, just as they pleased; whereupon Mr. MARTIN of Tewksbury, following the so much applauded example of SIR WILLIAM GEARY, who seconded the motion for taking the Charge into consideration, rose and seconded his motion. This conduct reflects great honour on these two gentlemen. It affords us an instance of the value of independent men, though they may not be given to make long speeches. This is the proper mode of proceeding. A member of parliament sees cause to impeach a man. He brings his charge. He calls for the evidence to support it. Both come before the House; and, when the House are in possession of them, it is for them to do what they please.

This is a thousand times better than impeachment by a *party*; which, besides that it can seldom be kept distinct from party motives, that is to say, motives very closely connected with the hope of getting into place, is pretty sure to be embarrassed by cabals, intrigues, and compromises.—Once more to come back to the debate; Messrs. Fox, Sheridan, Lord Henry Petty, Dr. Laurence, and several others spoke, and, though they wished the motion to be withdrawn, for the present, said they would vote for it, if the House divided. The two former did, however, still adhere to their former complaint, that Mr. Paull, after having moved for, and obtained, volumes of papers relative to other parts of Marquis Wellesley's conduct, had passed over them, and had now brought a charge without any papers at all. But, they forgot to answer what Mr. Paull had before said, and which was perfectly true, that the papers relative to no one of his other intended charges were yet, in a complete state upon the table, though some of them had been moved for in the last session of parliament. The papers relating to the Oude Charge, for instance, consist of Nos. from 1 to 5; and, No. 3, which is by far the most bulky, is not delivered to this day. With what reason, then, was he reproached for not bringing some *other* Charge? And, what was left for him to do, but to bring a Charge first, and call for the documents afterwards? But, there is something so unfair and unjust in this representation about "*volumes of papers*," that I must descend to particulars in order to expose it. Mr. Paull had moved for papers, in the last session of parliament, he had moved for some in this session. Obstacle upon obstacle, delay upon delay, had intervened; and, at the time when he laid his charge upon the table, at the very time when Messrs. Fox and Sheridan were reproaching him with having got volumes of papers without grounding any charge upon them; at that moment, the whole of the papers, called for by *him*, and delivered, amounted to no more than *fifty-four* pages! And, at the moment when I am writing, the papers, thus called for and delivered, amount, in the whole, to only *two hundred and thirty-three* pages! The papers are now lying before me; and, as to the delay in the printing, there are twenty printing offices in London, at either of which the whole could have been printed in forty-eight hours.—Where, then, are we to look for the candour, for the justice, which dictated the cry of "*volumes of papers*?" And, where are we to look, too, for the real cause of the delay in producing these two hundred and

three pages of papers?—It was, to be sure, with singular propriety that Mr. Sheridan joined in this cry! Mr. Sheridan, who, so long ago as the year 1802, called for volumes of papers relative to this same Lord Wellesley's conduct in the Carnatic. He obtained these papers. *Volumes* indeed were they. They have been upon the table of the House of Commons ever since 1803. Not a motion has he yet made upon them, though he has repeatedly pledged himself to prosecute the inquiry to the utmost. Now he comes and tells the House, that he still thinks the transactions in the Carnatic most flagitious; but, that he will not stir the subject, lest he should thereby divide the ministry! And yet this, this, this is the gentleman, who, in that same House of Commons, stands up and reproaches Mr. Paull with having called for papers without proceeding to ground a charge upon them! What could make a man think of acting thus? Why, I should be glad to know, is Mr. Sheridan to be allowed this latitude any more than Mr. Paull, or any other man? Is it, that Mr. Paull is not a *brother*? It would seem as if he were regarded as an alien; an intruder; an evil-minded person come to disturb the order of the combat for place and emolument.—Mr. Fox said, in the debate of Monday, that Mr. Paull had called for "*volumes of papers*, none of which had been *refused* him." No: not *refused* in words, but in *act*. Granted to him, but not put into his hands. And, besides, did Mr. Fox forget what had passed on the 19th of March, when Mr. Hiley Addington, seconded by Lord Temple, brought forward a motion to authorise the ministers *to withhold, at their discretion, any of the India papers that had been ordered by the House*. Mr. Fox was not decided as to the propriety of this motion: he found there were *precedents* for it; and, reader, observe, that these precedents were set by *Lord Castlereagh*! This made Mr. Fox hesitate. He sat down without giving any opinion; and the motion was, at last, withdrawn, when it appeared, that there was a general feeling of indignation rising against it. Not "*refused*," not actually refused, to be sure; but, the public will now be quite able to judge of the readiness, with which the papers have been granted.—The motion of Mr. Paull was, as it has already been observed, seconded by Mr. Martin of Tewksbury. Mr. Bragge (of whom we have not heard much since the 10th Report appeared) moved the previous question. His motion was seconded by Mr. Corry, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland. Both motions were, at last, with-

drawn; and the *Charge* remained in the state, where we before left it, with these additional circumstances, that the bringing of it forward was now shown to have been perfectly regular, and that the adherents of Lord Wellesley exhibited new and striking proofs of their sincerity when they professed to wish for the production and the publication of every paper relating to the conduct of Lord Wellesley! What can there be in this same charge? Mr. Paull has been spoken of as a person not adequate to the task he has undertaken; and thus the *MORNING CHRONICLE* (which I lament to see fast becoming what the *SUN* and the *COURIER* used to be) has, by its most unfair reports of the debates, endeavoured to represent him. Yet, it does seem, that he has produced a Charge having some weight in it; else why not let it go forth to the public? Why bring Mr. Sheridan down to prevent it from going even into the *Votes* of the House? Why make such efforts to prevent its being read? "Oh, that mine enemy had written a book!" So say not the advocates of Marquis Wellesley; so say not the advocates of "the Most Noble the Governor General." They seem anxious, to the last degree, to hide the book of their enemy from the world. What, a God's name, can there be in this Charge? And, why are we not to see it; especially as the gentleman, to use an Old-Bailey phrase, has brought it forward at his *peril*. It would be curious, were Mr. Paull to stop here, to see *what* would be done. To see how he would be made to experience the *peril* of having produced this Charge. To see how this new doctrine can be made good.—To stop, however, does not appear to be his intention; and, when the documents in proof are upon the table, we shall have the Charge in the public prints; for, it has been decided, in the Court of King's Bench, that, when papers have been printed by either House of Parliament, any man, out of doors, has a right to print and publish them; of which Mr. Sheridan, that distinguished friend of the *Liberty of the Press*, could not have been ignorant, when, on the 23d instant, he made his motion for rescinding the order, made by the House, to print the Charge! This gentleman it is, that we have to thank, that the Charge is not now before the public. "*Ex-parte!*" And are not all charges *ex-parte*? Must they not necessarily be so? If there is never to be any thing *ex-parte*, how is it possible for any inquiry ever to take place? If the Charge were now in the public prints, is not the same channel open to the denial? Are the *daily* prints leagued against Marquis Wel-

lesley, or for him? Who, that is conscious of his innocence, need care about the publishing of a Charge against him, provided the same vehicle be constantly ready to convey his defence? As to matters in private life, the case is different; but, if this principle be not permitted to be acted upon with regard to men in public stations, in the service of the public, the liberty of the press is a mockery; it is ten thousand times worse than nothing; because the liberty of the press being presumed to exist, a reliance upon its vigilance being placed by the people, its silence, as to the misconduct of public men, tends to deceive them; and, the more especially, because this same press is allowed to say as much as it pleases *in praise* of public men, and, indeed, much more than the consciences of the editors, if left to themselves, would permit to be said.—On Tuesday, the 29th instant, the papers, in manuscript, relative to the seizure of Furruckabad, were laid upon the table of the House; and, after they had been ordered to be so laid, Mr. Paull, in moving for the printing of them, reminded the House of what had been said about "the Volumes" that had been produced; whereupon Mr. Creevy (the new Secretary to the Board of Control) rose to say that Mr. Paull was under a mistake. Mr. Paull was proceeding to defend the correctness of his statement (it being the uniform custom for the maker of a motion to be entitled to reply), when, as the *Morning Chronicle* tells us, he was called to order by the Speaker. Mr. Paull contended, that he was strictly in order; and, that he could not help observing, that he was the only person, who was kept to strict order in that house, he being scarcely ever suffered to say a word by way of explanation, whilst others were suffered to make explanations of half an hour long. Upon which the Speaker appealed to the House, whether he deserved the imputation now cast on him; and, it seems that several members did cry out, *no, no, no!*—With the conveying of this appeal to the public, I shall now take my leave of the affairs of India for the present; and, probably, for several weeks, seeing that nothing further can be done with regard to the Charge, until the documents in support of it come before the House; and, as to other Charges, M. Paull will scarcely think of preferring any, until he has brought the first to a decided vote. "Divide, and you govern." So it is with men; and, if you divide the attention of the public, you destroy it; or, you greatly weaken it, at least. To the first Charge, therefore I hope, Mr. Paull will confine him-

self, until it be disposed of. — In the mean while, however, there are certain facts, certain undeniable, undisputed facts, which it will be useful for us to bear in mind. 1. That the East-India Company, according to the act renewing their charter in 1793, now owe the nation more than 6 millions of pounds sterling, not one shilling of which they are able to pay. 2. That Marquis Wellesley, according to his own letters to his employers, the East-India Company, acquired, in their behalf, great revenues and emoluments, from his extension of their sway and their territory in India. 3. That, notwithstanding these gains, the debt, which the Company owes in India, was, during his administration, augmented from 11 millions to 31 millions of pounds sterling. 4. That, notwithstanding all these immense receipts, from conquests as well as from loans, the finances of the Company, in India, were, upon the arrival of Marquis Cornwallis, as successor to Marquis Wellesley, in a state of the greatest embarrassment, the pay of the troops being no less than five months in arrear and every department connected with the army still more in arrear; in so much that Marquis Cornwallis was compelled to take the Company's money, destined to China for commercial purposes, wherewith to satisfy the urgent demands of the army. 5. That the finances of the East-India Company are now in a state, which Mr. Robert Thornton, one of the Directors, has described at "the brink of beggary;" and 6. That the Company, if at all rescued from this situation, must be so rescued by the means of taxes, raised upon the people of this country, 1 million of pounds having been what is called *paid* to the Company this year, while that Company is indebted to the nation to an amount upwards of 6 millions of pounds. — This was the topic, upon which, in the debate of Monday last, the Marquis of Douglas dwelt with so much force and effect. He said, that, "had he been present the former night, he would have opposed the rescinding the original order for printing the charge. The printing of the charge would not injure the accused, as it would be considered as standing only on the assertion of one of the members of the House, who, unsupported by any party, ought to be presumed to be acting from pure motives. The charge was a dead-letter till it was proved, and besides, the printing of it was necessary to enable the House to consider it. He had himself lately turned his attention to the affairs of India, and he was sure that there was great blame to be attached to some

one or other. The people of this country were already heavily burdened with taxes, and yet *they were now called upon for money to support the East-India Company.* It would be necessary to protect England against India as an hon. gentleman (Mr. Francis) had said, for the child which promised by proper care and nurture to become the support of the parent, was now hanging at the mother's bosom, and sucking the vital drops of her political existence" — And, will our representatives, will the "guardians of the nation's purse," grant our money by millions to the East-India Company? Will they suffer the vital drops of our political existence to be thus sucked away? And, will they do this, too, without inquiry, without strict inquiry, into the *causes* that have produced this great addition to our burdens? When they see one of their body endeavouring to obtain such an inquiry; when they see him rise, in behalf of the people, and prefer a charge against the man, whom he regards as the principal cause of these calamities; will they tell him, or suffer him to be told, that he prefers such charge *at his peril*? Let us hope not. Let us hope, that the same principles, which led to the measures, adopted with respect to Lord Melville, will still be predominant in the House of Commons. At any rate, let us hope, that Mr. Paull will persevere.

CHURCH AFFAIRS. — The *Stipendiary Curates' bill* (see page 560), brought in by Mr. Percival, was thrown out in the House of Commons, on Friday, the 25th instant, upon a division of 29 against 17. — The bill was supported by Mr. Percival, Mr. Fellowes, and Mr. Wilberforce; and was opposed by Sir John Wrottesley, Lord Portchester, Mr. Barham, and Mr. Fox. — The provisions of this bill gave too great encouragement to *Curates* to reside, by compelling the incumbents, at the discretion of the Bishop, to make certain allowances of glebe, house, and salary, to such Curates as might choose to reside. The main object was, and, I think, the effect would have been, to cause, in many cases, the incumbent to reside, and, in many others, a Curate to reside, in those parishes, where, at present, to the great injury of the Church, and the scandal of the nation, there are no resident ministers at all, and where, of course, the people have to choose between a meeting-house and a total neglect of attendance at places of divine service. — I shall be told, perhaps, that, though, in these parishes, there be no resident minister of the Church, yet, there is divine service regular



ly performed, once, at least, every Sunday. But, I ask, whether a poor Curate's walking or riding into the parish of a Sunday, hurrying over the service, and then hastening away again, leaving the people for another seven days without the means of baptism, or of visitation to the sick, and without the possibility of deriving any advantage whatever from the advice or admonition or example of a minister of the Gospel; I ask, whether it be thus that divine service can be performed; and whether this practice be at all consistent with the well-known and self-evident objects of ecclesiastical institutions and endowments? To lessen the magnitude of this scandalous abuse was the object of the bill, the objections to which were, that it trenched upon private property; that it was unjust in its principle, because it awarded to the Curate a compensation, not in proportion to the service performed, but in proportion to the worth of the living; and that it lodged too great a power in the hands of the Bishop.—As to this last, it was always an objection with me. I agree with Mr. Wilberforce, that it ought to have been made imperative, and not discretionary in the Bishop; for, many, too many by far, are the instances, in which we have seen Bishops heaping preferment on preferment upon their relations, and, at the same time, excusing them, by one means or another, from the due discharge of the duties thereunto attached. But, with respect to the other objections, I can see nothing solid in them. "Trench upon private property!" In Volume VII. pp. 788 and 809, it was, I think, shewn, that Church benefices are *not* private property; that the advowson is a *trust*; and that the benefice has attached to its tenure a condition of service, to which service residence is indispensably necessary. This is a branch of the subject, which, to do it justice, would require a good deal of time and room; but, I am firmly persuaded, that the day is not far distant when it will and must meet with a full discussion, unless the Church is, in the mean time, destined to fall under the weight of its accumulated abuses, of which abuses, that of non-residence is the principal cause of all the rest.—Of the other objection, that the compensation to the Curate would not be in proportion to the service performed, but in proportion to the worth of the benefice, we may observe, that it would be equally good against the inequality of the benefices themselves. For the propriety of this inequality the clergy in general have strongly contended, upon the ground, that, in the Church, as in all professions, there ought to be de-

grees of opulence, or of income; and, if this reason be good, as applied to incumbents, why should it be bad, as applied to Curates? Mr. Fox said the bill was good for nothing; that it professed to provide for what it could not effect; that the evil was in the existence of pluralities; and that, until they were done away no efficient remedy could be applied. I grant that the evil does not lie here, and that no remedy for the abuse can be quite efficient, until pluralities are done away. But, this bill would have done *something*; and, if the discretionary power of the Bishop had been exchanged for an imperative command upon him, it would have done *much*. I should prefer the radical cure; but, will Mr. Fox give us this cure? I imagine not; and, I imagine, too, that he will not stir one step towards it. The giving of pluralities is connected with politics and parties. It is a species of jobbing. It is one of the means by which a ministry obtain a corrupt support; and, for this, amongst other reasons, every good man must wish to see it put an end to. If the strict performance of the duty of a parish were inseparable from the receipt of the income of the living, the gift of a living would not be so valuable a thing. A sinecure is always worth more than an active office.—The way to bring this subject before the public, with a fair chance of producing a great and good effect, is, for some man, who has a few hundred pounds to spare, to refuse to pay tithes, upon the plea, that the incumbent, by not residing, does, agreeably to the will of the founder, and the very nature of the foundation, lose his right to the tithes. The defendant would lose his cause; statute upon statute would be quoted against him; but, he would awaken discussion, he would incite to inquiry; and these would lead to a reform of the monstrous abuse. Am I told, that non-residence has *always* prevailed? I deny the fact. And, if it has prevailed, in a greater or less degree, for seven hundred years past, in England, have we not, in more than one instance, seen the Church overturned by it? It prevailed in France, too; and in other countries of Europe it now does prevail; but, is the state of the Church, in those countries, such as to encourage us to continue the abuse here? It is in vain to hope, that the clergy themselves will begin the reformation. They have always been opposed to it; and, at the present day, they appear to be more opposed to it than ever.—What prevents the adoption of an effectual remedy (for all men see and acknowledge the *evil*), is, the connection, which the Church, by the means of

pluralities and consequent non-residence, is made to have with politics. A partizan is to be rewarded by a benefice given to his son, or some other relation or friend; but, there is no gift, if strict duty be required to be performed. A living of 500*l.* a year is worth something, while the duty can be performed by a Curate at the price of 30 or 50 pounds a year; but, if the whole of the time of the incumbent be taken up by the living, it is worth nothing. Thus, are the people, not only deprived of the services, in consideration of which tithes are paid, but they are further injured by the political influence which is obtained by the means of that deprivation! Mr. Fellowes stated, that, from the returns upon the table of the House of Commons, it appeared, that, out of 11,000 parishes (I take only the round numbers), there were 2,000 *without any resident minister at all*; and, there are, I believe, nearly 6,000, in which the incumbents do not reside! *Ought this to be so? Can it long continue so; especially when we consider, that, of the people, who are constant in their attendance at divine worship, nearly one-half have left the Church and have gone to the meeting-house?*

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM. (Continued from pages, 353 and 440). This title has been given to the remarks upon Mr. TIERNEY's bill, because there is not, in my opinion, any one so likely to remind my readers of the former opinions and conduct of that gentleman. It is not pretended, nor is it to be supposed, that the honourable gentleman has not seen good reasons for the change; but, he certainly will have too much candour to impute to us, who differ from him, any motives other than those arising from a conviction that his bill, if passed into a law, would be attended with mischievous consequences.—The bill was committed after the debate, which was noticed in page 440; and, on Tuesday, the 29th instant, upon the report being brought up, a motion was made for a recommitment, which produced a division of 24 for the recommitment and 14 against it. Shocking disregard of the great measure, by which Mr. Tierney seems to have thought, that he should convince the ministers and the country, that he was still alive! In the course of this debate, Mr. TIERNEY said, “that he wished the bill should be recommit-
“ for the sake of some amendments which
“ he meant to propose. It had been sug-
“ gested to him by a learned friend, that the
“ bill went somewhat farther than was in-
“ tended originally. Its object was to de-
“ clare the law. But there had been no

“ doubt that a candidate might provide a
“ carriage for the voter, though he ought
“ not to give money to the voter himself to
“ procure one. By *this bill*, however, the
“ candidate *could not even provide a car-*
“ *riage* for the voter, and thus far it went
“ beyond declaring the law. He wished to
“ amend it in this point, and therefore
“ moved that it be now recommitment. The
“ other amendments were merely verbal.
“ —SIR ROBERT BUXTON thought that
“ the candidate ought to be at no expense
“ with respect to the voters, and would ra-
“ ther have the law as it was, than agree to
“ pass the bill with the amendment.—
“ MR. PAULL thought that, however the
“ bill might be disguised, its effect would
“ be to *diminish the number of voters*, and
“ for that reason he would oppose it.—
“ LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON said that
“ his objections went to the principle of
“ the bill; and as to the recommitment,
“ there was only one clause in the bill, and
“ that one involved the principle itself. He
“ was against it, therefore, though he
“ believed the honourable gentleman could
“ have no motives in this business, except
“ such as were pure and honourable.—
“ MR. TIERNEY observed that the noble
“ lord did him no more than justice. He
“ himself could gain no advantage from the
“ bill, as the law was perfectly declared in
“ the place which he represented, and his
“ only object was to extend the advantage
“ to other places. If all expenses to the
“ candidate could be done away, he would
“ be very well pleased. But he had, at
“ first, carried the provisions of the bill
“ beyond the mere point of explanation.
“ When money had been given, the ques-
“ tion in the courts had been whether it
“ had been allowed for carriage money.
“ His object was to establish the point that
“ no money ought to be given at all, and
“ this, he apprehended, was the case as
“ the law stood at present. But nothing
“ was said in the law about carriages, and
“ if the bill was to prevent carriages from
“ being provided, it would be more than
“ an explanatory one.—MR. FRANCIS
“ thought that the amendment would alter
“ the principle of the bill considerably.
“ Carriages were to be allowed to convey
“ the voters, but how were they to be con-
“ veyed—alive or dead? An honourable
“ gentleman behind him whispered *dead*
“ *drunk*. Well, be it so, but if you gave
“ the voter nothing to eat or drink, in a
“ journey of 200 miles, he would scarcely
“ be alive by the time he came to the place
“ of polling; or, if he were alive, he would

"not be able to vote."—OLD GEORGE ROSE was decidedly for *the bill*!—"More than an explanatory bill"! Why, Mr. Tierney, did not you, from the very first, say that it was your intention to make it *more*? Was it not, by its very title, more than an explanatory bill? Was it not professedly to *alter* the act of William? And, was it not with a view of justifying this alteration, that your ingenious argument founded upon the *depreciation of money*, was introduced? And did it, Sir, require the suggestion of a "*learned friend*" to convince you; that the bill went farther than you yourself intended it should go? To hear you *now*, one would be ready to imagine, that the bill did not originate with *you*. Indeed, Sir, it would have been better to let it go off at the second reading; for now, like the miller with his ass, you have both the advocates and the opponents of your bill finding fault with it: Sir Robert Buxton, on one side, and Mr. Francis, on the other, join in condemning it. Its enemies assert that it is still mischievous; and the very best that its friends say of it, is, that it is good for nothing; while those amongst the public, whose attention the subject has attracted, in perceiving that you will fail to effect a virtual disfranchisement of a considerable portion of the present voters, are perfectly disposed to take the will for the deed, and to give you credit for it accordingly. The thing now to be considered, however, is, how this bill is to be *got out* of the House. When one cannot possibly live any longer, the only object of consideration is, how to make a decent exit. Into this deplorable situation the bill has been brought, not so much by its own unworthiness as by the doctrine with which it was introduced; for, if the arguments, founded upon the depreciation of money, had once become a ground of legislation as to the right of voters, it would not have been easy to say where its effects ought to stop. For a clever gentleman, like Mr. Tierney, therefore, to broach such doctrine, and for such a purpose, must be matter of astonishment with every body.—In opposing the principle of this bill, a weekly print, called the *INDEPENDENT WHIG*, has borne a part unworthy of its name. It has not entered much into Mr. Tierney's philosophy of politics; but, it has siezed fast hold of the prominent features of the proposed measure; and, I am inclined to think, that, if he has many of Mr. Tierney's constituents amongst its readers, he will find, that this *attempt* of his has not been without its effects.—"What!" said Lord Archibald Hamilton, "commit, and re-commit,

a bill which has but *one clause*, and that clause, of course, "*involving the principle of the bill*!"—But, my lord, if you objected to this, why not point out a way, in which the bill might be got out of the House? It is easy enough for a young man, like your lordship, to break out in exclamations of this sort; but, when you come to bring forth bills yourself, especially if they be a last resort for the reviving of your consequence, you will know how to feel for others whose offspring have come to an untimely end.

MILITARY AFFAIRS. (Continued from pages, 385, 513, and 552).—On Wednesday, the 30th ultimo, Mr. Windham moved, in the House of Commons, for the second reading of the bill to repeal the act, commonly called the *Parish Act*. There was a debate of some length, which ended in a division of 235 for the repeal, and 119 against it. Sir James Pulteney and Mr. Canning spoke against the repeal; Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Hawthorn, Mr. C. Dundas, and some others for it.—The opponents of the bill made this an occasion for discussing the merits of Mr. Windham's Plan; "*because*," said they, "*before we repeal the parish bill, let us see what we are likely to have in the place of it.*" But, this was proceeding upon a presumed admission, that the parish bill was good for *something*; whereas, it had, on the other side, always been contended, that it was good for nothing, and not only good for nothing, but that it was an evil unmixed with any good. To stop, therefore, as Mr. Canning proposed, till we saw what we were likely to have in the place of the parish bill, would have been as absurd as for a patient to cry out to his physician: "*stop! before you cure me of the plague, let me see what I am to have in the place of it.*" The parish bill is at once a torment and a disgrace to the country. The head, in which it was conceived, was made for *Change Alley*. It was the last of the fooleries of the shallow Pitt and his fry of youngling statesmen. All the men who it is pretended, were procured by it, have been procured by *crimps*; crimps have, under this bill, been, by Royal Authority, sent into every part of the kingdom; though, it will be remembered, that one of the professed objects of the scheme was, to put an *end* to crimping; to "*the infamous practice of crimping*," as the Grand Operator himself called it. One of the dangers which we have most to apprehend, is, that the people will become, at last, so weary of the many burdeas and vexations, to which they are subjected for, as is told them, the sake of

their country's defence, that they will say to themselves: "what change can possibly be for the worse?" This is a state of the public mind, to which every one must look forward with apprehension. Every possible means of preventing it should be adopted. And, I appeal to the reader, whether any measure, since the days of the famous Poll-Tax, was ever so unjust and so vexatious? It has disturbed the economy of every parish in the kingdom: it has imposed upon parish-officers duties, which, if they had been performed, would have almost deprived them of their personal liberty: it has, as far as it has operated, produced such confusion that never was before witnessed in this country. The Lord Lieutenant of Berkshire (Lord Radnor) showed wisdom and firmness in not being made the tool of an illegal request. He had no power, no lawful power, to call the parish officers together; and one cannot help being pleased to see, that all men in his situation, are not to be twisted about as the caprice of a shallow-headed minister, or some of his missions may dictate. The repeal of this weak and mischievous measure the country will receive as a boon; but, I agree, with Mr. Canning, that, viewing it in the light that I do, the repeal of it should have *come sooner*. I do not say, that the new ministers should have come forward with their plan sooner; but, regarding the parish bill as a mere curse upon the country (and as such, I think, they must regard it) there appears to me to have been no more reason for hesitating about getting rid of it, than for hesitating about getting rid of the caterpillar from amongst your cabbages, or the Hessian fly from amongst your wheat. Why the long hesitation and delay have taken place I know not, except we are to ascribe it to a system of "checks and balances," in the ministry, similar to those (only much more *efficient*) that Mr. Canning thought he discovered in the varieties of our military force.—This procrastination furnished the opponents of the repeal with a fair handle for entering upon an examination of the plan of Mr. Windham; because, from it they inferred, and not without reason, that the parish bill had been kept in hand, until a *substitute* was ready; and, it followed, of course, that, previous to the repeal of the bill, the merits of that substitute ought to be duly considered.—I agree with Mr. Canning (or rather, he agrees with me), that the plan of Mr. Windham is likely to be, as to the raising of men, *inefficient*! and that for the reasons which I have before stated, in page 522; but, I think the objection of

Sir James Pulteney of very little weight. He is afraid, that the service *for term of years*, instead of for life, will produce a relaxation of discipline; because the officers, in order to keep their men on to a second or third term, will be more kind to them than is consistent with the good of the service, with that subordination, that prompt obedience which is essentially necessary, not only to the duties, but even to the existence of a regular army. If this were to be the effect of the proposed alteration, I should be opposed to that alteration; but if the desire of the officers to retain their men should lead them no farther than to act justly, mercifully, and impartially towards them; if it should tend to ensure to the men a full and punctual payment of every thing that is their due and that is raised upon the people for them; if it should operate as a preventive of all acts of fraud committed upon the soldier, of all unjust detentions of his pay, his cloathing, or his provisions; if it should effectually prevent a system of never-ending attendance at parade, or elsewhere under the immediate command of some one or other; if it should give the soldier some hours in the twenty-four, wherein he might stretch his limbs and raise his voice at his own discretion; if, in short, it should for ever keep from the English service, every thing unjust, petty, and vexatious, what man, who is not as to mind, a mere GERMAN CORPORAL, will not receive the alteration with applause? And, who does not perceive, that, in producing the effects here spoken of (supposing Mr. Windham's alteration to be efficient for that purpose), it would produce another most important effect, that is to say, the *prevention of desertion*, that desertion, which I verily believe, now costs the country annually more money than will be wanted to meet all the additional expenses proposed by Mr. Windham; and, I further believe, that the number of men who now annually desert, is greater than the number that would annually quit service at the end of their first or second term, provided even the plan of Mr. Windham, defective as I think it, were adopted, and heartily acted upon.—Besides, how does Sir James Pulteney reconcile this argument of indiscipline with Mr. Canning's argument of non-retaining? The first confidently tells us, that, in consequence of the term-system, the soldiers will be spoiled by the means which their officers will use to retain them in the service; and the latter tells us, with equal confidence, that the soldiers will *not be retained* after the expiration of their term. Each of

these gentlemen may say, "my argument is a good one;" but, we must be allowed to insist, that either the one or the other is good for nothing.—Mr. Canning strongly urged the danger that might arise from the term system's letting loose a great number of men *at the breaking out of a war*. If this had any meaning at all, it was, that, at the breaking out of a war, the soldier would be likely to have a stronger desire to quit the service than he would have in time of peace. And here, one might, if one were inclined to join in the rabble-courting cant, ask, whether any thing so degrading as this has ever been said of the people of this country? Mr. Canning may be excused for a sentiment like this; but I appeal to any man acquainted with the dispositions of soldiers, whether a prospect of war is not, to them, always a cheering prospect? and, I appeal to Sir James Pulteney, whether the *soldiers* did not march against *Ferrol* with much greater satisfaction than he ever saw them march to a lingering parade or inspection, though, upon these latter occasions, entertained with the whistlings and creetchings and jinglings of a score or two of fantastically habited Germans and Blacks? Soldiers always rejoice at the prospect of war. A regiment for foreign service may, at any hour, be filled up by volunteers from other regiments. A regiment going abroad, and especially in war time, is an object of *envy* with other regiments; and this is so notorious in the army, it has been so frequently witnessed in every garrison in the kingdom, that one would really wonder where Sir James Pulteney can have imbibed the notion, that the men would, if at liberty to choose, quit the service because they saw war and foreign service approaching. But, the army, according to Mr. Windham's plan, would, to place no reliance upon the war-loving disposition of the soldiers, be so constituted, as to leave nothing to apprehend upon this score. At the War-Office it would always be known what number of men *could*, in such or such a year, leave the service in consequence of the expiration of their terms; and, of course, care would be taken to have others to supply their place. A few years' experience would render this a matter very nearly of certainty. What are war-offices for but to furnish thought and care as to such matters? Certainly, to the holder of a *sinecure* place; to one who is so fond of a *sinecure*, that, notwithstanding he has plenty of property of his own, he can continue to hold such place at the mere pleasure of the man of whom he is daily and hourly expressing his contempt; to such a person the idea of labour and of

attention seems quite inconsistent with official emolument. But, to others, it may surely be allowed to ask: what are war-offices for but to furnish thought and care as to such matters? And, if this be permitted, the answer is, that it would require but a small portion of either effectually to guard against any such danger as that which Sir James Pulteney and Mr. Canning have here conjured up.—The objection founded on the supposed difficulties that will arise in the *colonial service*, is a mere bug-bear. Suppose, for instance, there be 3 regiments serving in Jamaica, of 1000 rank and file each. Suppose that the men, upon an average, leave the service at the end of the 2d term. One fourteenth part of the men (supposing none to die, and also supposing the regiments never to come home) would have to be brought home every year, and an equal portion sent out in their place; and, where would be the mighty difficulty in sending out to Jamaica 214 men every year, and bringing home a like number? Three times the number might pass and repass in the steerage of the merchant ships! Not a single ton of transports ever need be employed for the service, even supposing that there was not, as there is, an exchange of King's ships, every year upon the station. But, do we not know, that the men sometimes die? Do we not know, that the *regiments* are, *now*, frequently changed in that service? And, in both these cases, are we not, without a term-system, obliged to send out fresh men? Every Island has, in proportion to its importance, and nearly in proportion to the strength of its garrison, merchant ships passing to and fro, and that, too, at all times of the year; and, after a very minute examination into the means of changing the men, I really cannot perceive any difficulty that will arise, in this respect, from the term-system, unless it be a difficulty to make the persons employed in the war-offices attend to their duty, and to do *something* for the immense sums of money that they receive from the public.—In a subsequent page of this sheet, the reader will find a project, which, it seems, has been presented to the present as well as the late ministry, relative to the defence of the West-India Colonies. The writer, whom I heard deliver his sentiments in the House of Commons, is entitled to great praise for the zeal he has shewn; and, if black troops are to be employed, I think his project the best. But, I must confess, that I see no necessity for black troops in the West-Indies any more than in St. James's Park. A slave-army has in it something so revolting, that I

cannot bring myself to bear the idea; and especially as I am convinced, that there is *no necessity* for it. The waste of Englishmen's lives is what no one can treat lightly; and, I am aware, that, as to the drain upon our population, the argument that might be applied in favour of voluntary emigration, will not apply to the army; because, in this latter case, the drain is upon the immediate *strength* of the country, whereas, in the former, the drain is upon that part of the population that is not moulded, and, in a great proportion that never can be moulded, into national strength, and here, therefore, the drain finds a natural counterbalance in the subsistence which it leaves behind, and which subsistence is sure to produce a corresponding population. But, though I agree, that the colonial service is a real drain upon the strength of the nation; yet, the security, both to the colonies and the mother country, from that drain arising, is, in my opinion, more than a compensation for it; and especially would it be so, if *a course of preparation* for the colonial service were adopted, and for which course, his Majesty's colonial possessions are most happily adapted. I have not room to enter here into much detail; but, I, for my part, can see nothing more easy than to give the necessary number of regiments, a preparative tour to Nova Scotia first; next to Bermuda; next to New Providence; and next to the West-India Islands. This would be attended with some expense; but what would this be in comparison with the torment, the continual torment, attendant upon an establishment of Black Troops? And, as the West-Indians have themselves suggested, why not agree with the colonial assemblies upon a scheme for *settling* in the islands such soldiers as might choose to remain there? But, alas! all this requires zeal and disinterestedness in the public service, somewhere or other. It requires labour and care in those offices, at home, which, having been *earned* (by what means I will not say), the holders but too often regard as a mere chancel of pecuniary emolument. There are many sinecures, rich sinecures, in the West-India islands. There is the large annual amount of the $4\frac{1}{2}$ per centum duty, paid by some of those islands. Why not resolve to appropriate these exclusively to the making of provision for the officers who have served in the West-Indies, or for the widows and children of such officers as may have lost their lives in that service? Would not this be more just than to bestow these emoluments on persons who have never passed a sleepless hour, the back of whose hand has never been tanned, not

only in the service of the West-Indies, but, in any public service whatever? "Oh! you jacobin!" perhaps Mr. Canning, the famous anti-jacobin writer, will exclaim. Well, Sir, be it so; but, at the same time, be you assured, that, unless a principle of action such as is here implied, be speedily adopted, and steadily adhered to, there will arise events, before which all your waking dreams of ambition will vanish like the illusions of the drunken tinker.—There is one passage in Mr. Canning's speech (as reported in the Morning Chronicle), which, considering the quarter whence it came, has, I must confess, excited, in my mind at least, no small degree of surprise.—"Without too great a veneration for the establishments and opinions of our ancestors he" (Mr. Canning, observe), "might disapprove of carrying the regular army to an unlimited extent without any thing to *balance* it. In emergencies, our regular army might be thus augmented along with our other forces. But he was proceeding with it in a manner that *would sap all the checks upon it constitutionally established*. He might say that our checks were nothing, as our militia and regular army could never be drawn out against each other. God forbid that they should. But look at the analogy of our civil establishments. What were they but a system of checks and balances, which had a silent operation? If the right hon. gent.'s system was to have its full effect, *10 years hence a member might rise in that House, and declare his sentiments with very different feelings from those by which he was actuated*. A standing army, therefore, was still to be regarded with jealousy. But, at the end of the war, the militia too was to be renewed by bounties, and by that means, it would be equally in the power of the crown as the regular army, and he maintained that the great objection to this bill, was, *that it put too much in the hands of the crown*; and, therefore, in some measure, superseded the use of the militia. For the first time since the revolution, the supplies were voted before the estimates were presented, and it became the House to consider the more, what sort of army we were to have. The Mutiny Bill would *not be a sufficient check on the regular army thus constituted*."—In the sentiments, expressed by the words which I have marked with *Italicks*, I agree, for the reasons stated in pages 524, 525, and 526, I perfectly agree with Mr. Canning; and, if the reader has referred to

those
he wi
in ans
at leas
ham,
of bal
influe
milit
I am
army
as it n
ment,
degrad
sively
of all
berties
exact
the ar
theren
minist
of Wa
some
ed. C
LONEL
pledge
upon t
fice hir
all is
his not
Sherid
relativ
This a
MAJOR
by the
uors;
person
directl
power,
up his
remain
Fitzpat
power,
preroga
was in
the Ge
some d
exercis
20, or
officere
power,
army o
short, i
military
must be
are wh
crown;
this gov
fore, d
plan (w
honour
crown)

those reasons, and has duly weighed them, he will, I think, join me in the opinion, that, in answer to such an objection, *something*, at least, should have been said by Mr. Windham, or by Mr. Fox. The notion, however, of balancing this power of the Crown by the influence of a *variety* in the species of our military force, I do not, by any means adopt. I am for a balance in the constitution of the army itself; for, while the army is so large as it now is, and while the power of appointment, of dismissal, of exaltation, and of degradation, is lodged absolutely and exclusively in the Crown, to the exclusion, too, of all responsibility in the adviser, the real liberties of the people must always be in an exact inverse proportion to the strength of the army and to the honours and emoluments thereunto attached.—From the present ministers (to say nothing about the Council of War, which they moved for last year) some alteration, in this respect, was expected. General Fitzpatrick, in the case of COLONEL JOHNSTONE, stood pledged, firmly pledged, to propose some specific measure upon the subject. Since he has been in office himself, he has, I suppose, found out that all is right enough; for he has withdrawn his notice of a motion, in like manner as Mr. Sheridan has given up his promised motion relative to the transactions in the Carnatic. This absolute power is, too, as in the case of MAJOR DAVISON, allowed to be exercised by the East India Company and their Governors; and, considering the great number of persons, who are now, either directly or indirectly, become subject to this species of power, where is the man, not having made up his mind to abject subjection, who can remain unalarmed? This power, General Fitzpatrick will now tell us, this absolute power, is the acknowledged and undoubted prerogative of the Crown; and that so it was in the best days of Whiggism. But, the General must not forget, that there is some difference between this power, when exercised with regard to an army of 10, or 20, or 30 thousand men (the militia being officered by the counties), and the same power, when exercised with regard to an army of from 150 to 300 thousand men. In short, if this be rendered a country wholly military, as with a force of this amount it must be; and, if the officers of the army are wholly dependent upon the will of the crown; if this should be the case, what will this government then be? Anxiously, therefore, do I hope, that, if Mr. Windham's plan (which will place so much additional honour and emolument at the disposal of the crown) be adopted, some means, some ef-

fectual means, will be found out and adopted for rendering the officers less dependent, or, in other words, for rendering their situations, their means of living with reputation, their very existence, so secure as not to be affected materially without some sort of legal proceeding.

It was my intention to have offered some remarks upon the SLAVE TRADE BILL, now before parliament; and also upon the subject of the *Hanoverian War*; but, I have not room; and, besides, the reader will find, here below, a letter upon each of these subjects. Upon the subject of the Hanoverian war, I do not quite agree in some of the more general notions of my correspondent; but, with respect to the particular points relating to this war, I perfectly agree with him. The letter upon the Slave Trade Bill is worthy of particular attention.

SLAVE TRADE BILL.

SIR,—The sentiments you have on several occasions expressed on the subject of the Slave Trade, and the readiness with which you, at all times, introduce into your valuable Register communications intended to be useful, lead me to hope, that you will favor this letter with insertion, which has for its object to point out the nature and effects of the bill, which has been introduced into parliament by the attorney general, for prohibiting the supply of the colonies surrendered to his Majesty during the present war, with slaves, in a greater number than is deemed necessary to keep up the existing black population: and also for prohibiting British subjects from being directly, or indirectly, concerned in the Slave Trade, with any foreign settlement or country whatever.—To those who reflect on the importance of a trade which occupies nearly 150 ships, carrying 30,000 tons, and employing from 4 to 5,000 seamen; in which is engaged, a capital of upwards of 2 millions; which gives bread to many thousands of men, women, and children, employed in our manufactories; and contributes so largely to the revenue; it will not require much argument to prove, that a measure which will annihilate at one blow, nearly one half of that trade, and greatly injure the remainder, should be maturely considered, and that the benefit to result from it should be well ascertained before it is carried into effect; it would, however, appear from the reception which this bill has met with in the House of Commons, that, by the generality of the members, it is deemed, what, no doubt, the honorable author intends it should be, an act of hu-

manity to the slaves; a boon to the old British colonies; and a measure of general expediency: while, to me, it appears to be just the reverse of all this, and as far as respects, the surrendered colonies, a breach of faith on the part of this government, which I am not aware, that any policy can justify.—And first, Sir, as to the trade on the African coast.—The trade in slaves being open to all nations, no act of the British parliament can prevent foreigners from obtaining a supply; the question then is, whether, with a view to the comforts of the negroes, and to the interests of this country, it is more advisable that we should be the carriers, or oblige foreigners to go to the fountain-head and supply themselves? the answer I take to be obvious; that, while the trade is unrestrained, the merchant is encouraged, by the great demand, to bring to our colonies a greater number of slaves than is required for their cultivation, and in consequence, the British planter has all advantage of pre-emption, while the foreigner is obliged to take his leavings at a higher expense: on the contrary, if the bill should pass into a law, nearly one half the trade would be transferred to foreigners, and the remainder permitted under such discouraging circumstances, as must render the supply from our own islands extremely precarious and very expensive.—It is, therefore, a matter of astonishment to me, to hear gentlemen of extensive knowledge and great respectability, argue, that this bill is one of the best measures that can be adopted for the interest of the old West-India islands. That it will prevent foreigners from procuring slaves, and by confining the British supply to our own islands, render them cheaper to ourselves.—As before observed, both the eastern and western coasts of Africa are open to all nations; there is nothing to prevent the French, the Americans, the Portuguese, the Danes, the Spaniards, or the Dutch, from buying slaves on that coast as well as the English: there was a time, indeed, when these traders were considered by our Guinea captains as the most contemptible opponents: their trade extended only to the purchase of refuse slaves; it could not be otherwise; they had bad cargoes, and did not understand it: but see what industry and encouragement from the state can produce; a short time, previous to the late war, the French had made such wonderful progress, that they drove us completely out of the Angola and Whydah trade; they became our most formidable rivals, not only in the Bight and on the Windward coast, but even in the midst of our own settle-

ments on the Gold coast; and what is more, they went round the Cape of Good Hope, and brought thousands of slaves from the eastern coast of Africa; a trade, which we are not permitted to attempt; and there is not a doubt, had the peace and tranquillity of France and its colonies continued for a few years longer, but with such great encouragements as they enjoyed, and such heavy discouragements as we suffered, they would have wrested the whole of it from us.—Now, Sir, there is nothing extravagant in supposing that other nations may be encouraged to imitate what the French effected with so much success; there wants only the occasion, or the necessity to induce them to make the trial: our dereliction of so much of the trade will be a strong temptation to others to profit by our folly: to the French whenever the return of peace will permit it; to the American states immediately; but the necessity must have a more powerful operation on the Spaniards in particular; they have already learned how much it is their interest to purchase slaves for themselves, and not to depend upon a precarious and humiliating supply from the refuse of others: sensible of this truth, they have held out the most tempting offers to people in this country to carry on the trade from their ports, which, if the present bill should pass, there will, it is to be feared, be numbers ready to accept as soon as opportunities shall offer: under such circumstances, can it be imagined that any act of the legislature of this country will be a means in the smallest degree of hindering their supply.—The whole of the British export of slaves from Africa amounts to about 36,000 annually; of these, about one half go to the service of the established British islands; one fourth to the surrendered colonies, and the remainder to foreigners, chiefly the Spaniards and Americans. The present bill, therefore, is intended to deprive us of the trade (allowing 5000 for the annual supply to the surrendered colonies) for 13,000 slaves, of which 9000 will be provided by other nations. The effect of such a measure upon our West-India colonies must necessarily be this, that the competition against us being so greatly increased, and on the other hand, our influence in the market proportionably lessened; it will be impossible for us to obtain either so good an assortment, or at so moderate a price as formerly; all which must fall upon the West-India planter; and further, that the restraint in the West-India market will discourage the slave merchant from risking his property even to the extent necessary for the supply of our

islands, and more especially Jamaica, because if he cannot sell there, he will have no ulterior resort.—I think it, altogether, unnecessary to say any thing more to shew that it behoves the West-India planter, above all others, to oppose the present bill, which in every point of view is injurious to his interests; because it not only renders more uncertain and more expensive the supply of labourers for his estates, but after having got them, it renders those very labourers of less value to him, by limiting his market, if he has occasion to sell them.—It is a most erroneous notion, that our islands have but little concern in the discouragement of the British slave merchant; the planter must share in the burthens of the merchant; one strong proof of this is, the present enormous price of slaves, occasioned in a great degree by American competition unrestricted by limitations.—The length of this letter deters me from offering observations on the consequences, that must result from the loss of those valuable returns, of bullion, dying stuffs, &c. which are so important to our colonies and manufactories; I cannot, however, dismiss the subject without adding a quotation from a letter which the last packet brought me from a respectable gentleman, who, encouraged by his Majesty's proclamation, established himself as a planter at Surinam.—“The clamour here (against the order in council in August last for prohibiting the importation of slaves) is universal; the Dutch say, and very truly, that when they surrendered to the British, their faith was pledged that Surinam should enjoy the same privileges with the others (his Majesty's) colonies. The new beginners, on estates, are ruined by the order; and the holders of uncultivated lots, that they have paid for, and upon which they have paid all the taxes, &c. are *pour ainsi dire*, deprived, if not of their property, of all the value of it; namely, the right of cultivation. From the construction our lieutenant-governor has put upon the order and the conditions annexed to obtaining the limited supply, the order amounts to a prohibition, insomuch, that I do not expect to see any more negroes sold here publicly. If there exists a cause stronger than another that makes the negroes dissatisfied, it is the want of women, particularly upon the new plantations in the Saramacca, where you will frequently find estates with 100 men and 5 women. In fact, government must extend the importation here, for a short time, or else the colony had better be in the hands of

“the French, the Dutch, the Spaniards, or “the devil.”—I have been induced to give you the above quotation from having heard it mentioned in the House upon the report of the bill, that the planters themselves had evinced no dissatisfaction at the prohibition.—I am, Sir, your constant reader, and obedient servant.—C. S.—26th April, 1806.

MR. WINDHAM'S PLAN.

SIR,—Your indulgence to my letter of the 8th instant, emboldens me to attempt a few further observations on the proposed change in military affairs. However much the vain and the weak may feel the loss of their empty titles, and gaudy trappings, by the change of the volunteers, I am persuaded the principal cause of that ferment now existing in the country is, the idea of the distinction admitted by the new plan, by which the richer classes are to be allowed to amuse themselves in the present trifling system; and which gives to the training, which if borne by all, would have been a hardship to none, the odious appearance of oppression on the lower classes. An absurd outcry has been raised against the plan of mixing all ranks and conditions of men at these drills. I should like much to know what infection in body or in mind, the most delicate or conscientious can inhale, by standing or moving in a line, where silence and order must be the basis of every operation. It surely cannot be any of those, who as officers of the volunteers, have been in the daily habit of coaxing, begging and beseeching every shoo black in their corps to *favour* them with their attention, who are so squeamishly scrupulous. But, Sir, without forming any asylum, merely for the convenience of such men, they have the option of another species of service, in the ranks of the yeomanry, which under proper regulations will in time of need be found a most useful description of force, and well adapted for every purpose of desultory warfare. These corps should be arranged in squadrons, under the command of an officer with rank of captain, and a certain number of these squadrons should be placed under the direction of an officer of cavalry; not a general, followed by inspectors, aids-de-camp, &c. &c.; but under an intelligent and active officer, who would be more properly termed an instructor than an inspector, whose duty and authority should enable him to act, not to look and bow to these men. This officer of course should be appointed by his Majesty, and in the army. The abuses that have taken place in the appointment of the inspectors, will show the necessity of this latter regulation. The rules

under which these were appointed will be found in the Register, Vol. IV. page 499. And after reading these rules, I would ask any man, if he should expect to find in the list of these inspectors, field officers whose laurels were gained in the fencibles or militia; officers, who in the midst of a war had sold out of the army to the best bidder; or, least of all, officers who had been ordered to quit the service? Can we wonder, Sir, at the complaints against these men, or at their fulsome compliments? Who can have so perverted the meaning of *distinguished reputation*, as to recommend such appointments? I do not pretend to say, but I cannot suppose it possible that the commander-in-chief could be the person. If he had advised such a measure, I cannot think Mr. Windham would point him out as the fittest person, in whose hands the rewards and honours of the soldier are to be deposited. Before I conclude this letter, I cannot help joining my regret at the adoption of the German troops, more particularly at seeing British dragoons, at this moment dismounted, to be sent to defend colonies, and delivering their horses to Germans to defend our own country. This is not the system to which we looked forward, when under the enlightened and liberal genius of Mr. Windham, nor can I help suspecting that the same temporising policy, so strongly portrayed in the other branches of the government, cramps his energies in the military department.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant. MILES. April 28, 1806.

HANOVERIAN WAR.

SIR,—I am induced to trouble you with a few hasty remarks on Mr. Fox's late speech, on occasion of his Majesty's Message to Parliament. Whether my observations may coincide with your opinion on the subject, I know not; but in one point, I think we shall agree; that discussion must lead to good inasmuch as it tends to the ascertainment of facts, and the establishment of political truth; and that these are times, which demand, on great public occasions, a manly avowal of opinions, without regard to individual advantage, party prejudices, or public clamour.—With all the impressive eloquence that could flow from elevated genius, and an ardent and generous mind, Mr. Fox held out to merited censure, the disgraceful policy of the Prussian cabinet. The people of this country are (nationally speaking) animated with a spirit too similar to his own, not to feel, as he would wish, a general sentiment of indignation. But, Sir, let me call your attention to one part of his Majesty's decla-

ration, rendered still more important by its cordial adoption by Mr. Fox, who avows that he felt particular pleasure in announcing it to the Prussian minister. I mean his Majesty's explicit assurance, that "no convenience of political arrangement shall induce him to consent to the alienation of the Electorate."—Now, this leads to a conclusion, which cannot fail to be highly alarming to every man who feels the pressure of the war; (and who is there that is not tremblingly alive to such feelings?) for it holds out to us the comfortable prospect, that our cabinet will be little inclined to any negotiation, which shall not have for its basis the restoration of this Electorate. To how formidable a distance does this throw our prospect of peace! And, after all, Mr. Cobbett, does the object appear to any man of plain understanding to be attainable, unless under circumstances, and in consequence of events on the Continent, which do not, at this moment, present themselves as at all probable to the most sanguine imagination?—Sir, what I would wish to depreciate, is the very thing which seems now aimed at, as if by general consent of all parties; namely, an attempt to interest the generous feelings of Englishmen at the expense of their judgment: "never give up the loyal inhabitants of Hanover," cries Mr. Fox, and Lord Castlereagh echoes the injunction. When they do agree at St. Stephens, as Mr. Puff says, "their unanimity is wonderful."—But, Sir, is it consistent with a genuine spirit of loyalty and patriotism, to ask these orators of congenial fire to descend from the clouds, and inform us in the first place, how the restoration of these territories is to be effected, and in the next, (if we may be allowed to whisper the question) how far the object is worth attaining? That his Majesty must feel a fond attachment to the dominions of his ancestors is naturally to be expected; and every man of a generous mind must sympathise in his grief and indignation, at the unprincipled aggression which has torn them from his possession. But, were not the advice more sage, though perhaps less palatable, that should rather endeavour to reconcile him to an inevitable loss, than encourage wild and rash hopes of redeeming it? In spite of local attachments, true British interests must ever be the primary object of a British Sovereign; and it were almost treason to suppose it possible that his Majesty could wish, his cabinet advise, or his people acquiesce in, the protraction of a hopeless contest, or the sacrifice of any great national object, for the redemption of continental dominion.—Sir, these times of

strange calamities those of its detestable less could the high almost now When compar from the subject wonder never if we can ter, uni power, former, for the appears Sovereign give wa of the C the saga an admin have av cured a this nece with a fi all the b insular s and whi unite p our amp protest a against rash vow unattain What I tion of differe consequ Majesty be allow state of much to posed. vert to a Fox's ap ver as a position his ingen letter, su ration as pear wor lic servie ed, if it c cuss the keenness mark.—

strange event are pregnant with incidents of calamity, with losses, and privations. In those of an humbler station the progress of its deterioration is less observable, but not less constant and oppressive, while those in the highest, who could, in happier periods, almost mock the inconstancy of fortune, are now subject to its most terrible reverses. When we contemplate empires reduced to comparative insignificance, kingdoms torn from their ancient dynasties, and free nations subjected to a foreign yoke, we shall the less wonder and repine at the separation of Hanover from the Crown of Great Britain; and if we can preserve to our Sovereign the *latter*, unimpaired in splendour, dignity, and power, though we may regret the loss of the *former*, as an evil, we ought to be grateful for the comparative good.—Unhappily, there appears an unavoidable necessity for our Sovereign and his people, for the present, to give way to the dreadful change in the state of the Continent, produced by events, which the sagacity of Mr. Fox foresaw, and which an administration conducted by him might have averted, but which *now* are not to be cured and controuled. At the same time this necessary acquiescence should be coupled with a firm, steady determination to defend all the blessings and advantages, which our insular situation has hitherto preserved to us, and which it cannot fail ever to secure, if we unite prudence with energy, and husband our ample resources. But, Mr. Cobbett, I protest against all fits of philanthropic fury; against all wild denunciations; against all rash vows of continuing to make war for *unattainable*, or *unimportant* objects.—What I had intended for the loose occupation of an hour, has grown to unallowable diffuseness. I had intended to touch on the consequences of the present change to his Majesty's Hanoverian subjects, for I must be allowed to doubt, whether, in the actual state of the Continent, it is altogether so much to their disadvantage as has been supposed. I should also, *with reluctance*, advert to a sort of *side wind* inuendo, in Mr. Fox's speech, as to the importance of Hanover as *an appendage to Great Britain*: a position which, I think, it would require all his ingenuity to maintain *seriously*.—If this letter, subject to such compression and alteration as you think fit, or any part of it appear worth notice, it is at your and the public service. If not, my object will be gained, if it only leads you to reflect on, and discuss the subject it contains with your usual keenness of research, and boldness of remark.—BRITANNICUS.

COLONIAL SERVICE.

SIR,—In a letter addressed to you, under date the 30th of March, inserted in your Register of the 5th of April, Major Cartwright puts the following queries to you.—“But now, Mr. Cobbett, let me, in my turn, ask you, if you have duly considered, the demands of men for all foreign services, before the residue becomes applicable to home defence? Where you shall have provided garrisons for Gibraltar, Malta, the Cape of Good Hope; armies for Canada, New Brunswick, and all our West India Islands; other armies for our widely extended Asiatic dominions; and our Asiatic wars; others again for Guernsey, Jersey, and Ireland; besides a disposable force for Mediterranean or other expeditions; how many of your 200,000 men will be left at home; and after making the necessary deductions for raw recruits, remain as our efficient defence?”—Forcibly struck with difficulties, similar to the preceding; a gentleman who, for some time, had a seat in the present Parliament, was induced to submit the following ideas to the House of Commons, and there, though they were uttered with some degree of confusion, from his want of the habit of public speaking, or ability to arrange them, they so far attracted notice, that one of the late ministry, in his own name, and in that of his principal, desired to have them in writing; and they were accordingly, hastily thrown upon paper and delivered to him.—Previously to the gentleman's vacating his seat, the substance of them was also transmitted to Mr. Fox.—I am not without apprehension, Mr. Cobbett, from the contempt with which, if I recollect right, you have in some part of your work, spoken of the people, of whom my opinion is very different, that these ideas may meet with but an unfavourable reception from you, and I have an additional reason to suspect this, from not having observed any subsequent notice bestowed on them, by those to whom they were originally submitted.—At all events, however, I will now venture to lay them before you, confident that you will endeavour to dismiss, as far as in your power, all undue prejudice from your mind, and after obtaining information from those able to furnish it, afford the subject a candid consideration. They were then as follows: viz. “From what has passed lately in the Island of St. Domingo, our West-Indian colonies appear exposed to new and imminent danger, both internal and external, and it is, therefore, the part of prudence to

make early provision to meet its occurrence. —It is impossible to suppose the Negroes of our colonies unacquainted with the success of their brethren, or unanimated with the hope of being able at some period or other to imitate their example *. —The West-Indian islands have hitherto furnished few, or no resources of offensive war to their European masters, and their exterior means of defence can no longer be relied on as formerly. In the event of an attack from without, abetted by internal commotion, it would certainly be found insufficient, except provided on a scale much larger than can be afforded, consistent with the pressing necessity of keeping our forces, as much concentrated as possible at home. The destructive ravages which the climate of the West-Indies have ever been found to make in the constitutions of our countrymen, must also render it extremely difficult to keep up, even our present establishment of troops in them; for, I imagine no circumstance opposes so strong an objection to the regular military service of the state, both amongst the officers and privates, as the idea of being ordered to the West Indies. "*Quæ nempe et nostro lethum miserabile fratri attulit. Hic misero frater adempte mihi.*"—It was these considerations that induced me at the close of the last session of parliament (on the 10th of August) to hazard a suggestion, which if adopted, I fondly hoped, might in a great degree provide for our colonial demand for troops, both for defensive and offensive purposes, and consequently, add materially to the disposeable strength of our own country. —I assumed that we held a dominion in the East, over a population of fifty millions of enlightened and obedient subjects; which population of itself, probably, was not inferior in number to the host, under the command of the government of France. I stated, however, that I did not pretend to aver that our fellow subjects in the East, were physically equal in energy or strength to the hardy sons of more northern regions, in which I would on no account, propose to bring them to combat †. That as they were ne-

* E. G. Late occurrences in Trinidad.

† I am as well aware as the author of the Inquiry into the State of the Nation can be of the difference between European and Indian troops, although I do not think the difference now prevails to the degree which it did, when the Roman Historian wrote, from whom he quotes, or that our Indian battalions would disgrace themselves if brought vertheless capable of a very high degree of

military discipline, possessed great bravery, and had manifested a fidelity to our cause, in difficulties unexampled; and, as his Majesty possessed other dominions situated in climates similar to their own; I was of opinion, that in these, a large proportion of the force entertained, *if raised for the express purpose, and under due precautions*, might be advantageously drawn from our possessions in the East. That this part of the force would be found the best adapted to the service. That it would prove alike capable of resisting the vertical sun of the day, as the pernicious damp of the night. That by becoming a counterpoise to the Negro population, it would afford security to the planters against their insurrections; and scour the mountains and woods when they might retire to them. That were these troops encouraged to take their families with them to the islands, aided also by other means, that might be adopted, of peopling them in part from the East, in process of time they would produce a race of orderly and industrious freemen, both to cultivate and defend them; and, in the end, do away the necessity of having recourse to the odious and atrocious practice of the slave trade. Finally, that it would materially economise the valuable lives of our own countrymen. The following are a few of the particular propositions that immediately suggest themselves; others, no doubt would be required for bringing the plan to maturity and perfection.—I. That the troops destined for the West-Indies might be best qualified to resist the effects of the climate, they should be levied from the maritime or most southern parts of Bengal, especially Chittagong, Orissa, the Coasts of Coromandel and Malabar; the air and climate of which places, I am persuaded would be found to correspond with the West-Indies. The natives of the upper and dry regions of Hindostan, would prove as little able to resist their effects, as Europeans.—II. That the several corps should be composed of young able bodied men, as many of whom as could be induced to do so, should be encouraged to take their families with them.—III. That they should be enlisted for a term of years (probably not less than seven) with the certain assurance of being furnished with the means of returning to their own country, when their time of service had expired, by the vessels which might bring recruits for their several corps. (To be continued.)

in contact with the troops of Naples, or with some others of Italy. Vide page 88, in the note.